

**Yes, the King James Bible IS Perfect**  
A Biblical response to Bible critics

### **Introduction**

This article is based on the writer's response to a leaflet published some years ago that declares the King James Bible to be imperfect. It is hoped therefore that this article will encourage all true Bible believers to hold fast to the AV1611 as "*all scripture...given by inspiration of God*" 2 Timothy 3:16.

### **Critical Inconsistency**

The leaflet begins with the statement that the AV1611 "*is an excellent translation*" and "*the word of God in English.*" However, its last paragraph asks "*What is the word of God today?*" The answer is that "*The word of God exists wherever a faithful translation is made of what was originally written. To a very high degree, that is what the KJV is.*" That is, the AV1611 is not "*an excellent translation*" nor "*the word of God in English*" but rather "*a faithful translation*" that isn't quite "*the word of God*" but contains "*the word of God...to a very high degree.*" This type of inconsistency is typical of Bible critics.

### **Old Fashioned English**

It is not surprising then to read that the AV1611 English is "*old fashioned.*" However, Dr Lawrence M. Vance has shown in his book *Archaic Words and the Authorised Version* that much of the AV1611 vocabulary is found in many respected contemporary journals. Dr Edward F. Hills has said "*the English of the King James Version...is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is biblical English...*" See *The King James Version Defended*, p 218. "*The English of the King James Version*" is therefore both familiar and timeless.

The leaflet, of course, does not mention the many contemporary AV1611 expressions, e.g. "*addict,*" "*artillery,*" "*God save the king,*" "*powers that be,*" "*head in the clouds,*" "*housekeeping,*" "*communication,*" "*learn by experience,*" "*labour of love,*" "*shambles,*" "*advertise,*" "*publish,*" "*beer,*" "*the course of nature*" etc. This is yet more inconsistency, of which Proverbs 11:1 states:

**"A false balance is abomination to the LORD."**

### **Differences between AV1611 Editions**

The leaflet, predictably, objects to differences between AV1611 editions. However, in *Translators Revived* pp 223-224, Alexander McClure describes the results of a comparison between six AV1611 editions, including the original 1611 edition, carried out by the American Bible Society in 1849-1852. He states:

*"The number of variations in the text and punctuation of these six copies was found to fall but little short of twenty-four thousand. A vast amount! Quite enough to frighten us, till we read the Committee's assurance, that "of all this great number, there is not one which mars the integrity of the text, or affects any doctrine or precept of the Bible."*"

In spite of this 160 year-old assurance, the leaflet then cites 8 notable examples drawn from 421 readings where the contemporary AV1611 is claimed to differ significantly from the 1611 AV1611. They are as follows, the 1611 reading followed by the 2012 reading, with this writer's comments.

1. Genesis 39:16, "**her lord**" versus "**his lord**"

1 Peter 3:6 and Esther 1:22 show that *both* readings are correct. Unlike Sarah, Potiphar's wife was not a godly woman but her attempted infidelity did not affect her status before her husband in God's sight.

2. Leviticus 20:11, "**shall be put to death**" versus "**shall surely be put to death**"

The omission of "**surely**" from verse 11 in the 1611 edition is a printing error but the text is not affected.

3. Deuteronomy 5:29, "**my commandments**" versus "**all my commandments**"

The 2012 edition simply has added emphasis.

4. 2 Kings 11:10, "**in the temple**" versus "**in the temple of the Lord**"

2 Kings 11 reads "**house of the Lord**" in verses 3, 4 twice, 7, 15, 18, 19 and "**temple of the Lord**" in verse 13 so there is no contradiction between editions about the identity of the "**the temple**" in verse 10.

5. Isaiah 49:13, "**God hath comforted**" versus "**the Lord hath comforted**"

Both editions are consistent with respect to the identity of the Comforter in verse 13.

6. Ezekiel 24:7, "**poured it upon the ground**" versus "**poured it not upon the ground**"

The 1611 reading is a printing error, corrected in subsequent editions.

7. 1 Timothy 1:4, “*edifying*” versus “*godly edifying*”

There is no uncertainty in either edition about the “*godly*” nature of the edifying.

8. 1 John 5:12, “*the Son*” versus “*the Son of God*”

Both editions are clear about the identity of “*the Son*” although the 2012 AV1611 reading is more explicit. It was introduced in 1638, according to Dr. Scrivener, *The Authorized Version of the English Bible (1611)*, p 193.

The American Bible Society has this appraisal:

*“That the edition of 1611, although prepared with very great care, was not free from typographical errors; and that, while most of these were corrected in the edition of 1613, others in much greater number were nevertheless then introduced, which have since been removed. That the revision of Dr. Blaney made by collating the then current editions of Oxford and Cambridge with those of 1611 and 1701 had for its main object to restore the text of the English Bible to its original purity: and that this was successfully accomplished.”*

**God’s Word Before 1611**

Typically for such publications, the leaflet asks “*Where was the perfect, inerrant, preserved word of God in 1610?*” Dr. Miles Smith explains in *The Translators to the Readers*.

*“Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one, not justly to be excepted against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark.”*

**Marginal Differences**

Again, typically, the leaflet states that “*The KJV translators suggest thousands of corrections...[the 1611 translators] did not believe they had picked exactly the right word or phrase in every case. They included the following in the margin: 4,223 more literal meanings, 2,738 alternative translations and 104 variant readings.*”

The marginal insertions show that the AV1611 translators were honest researchers. Of their efforts, the Trinitarian Bible Society stated in *Fruit Among The Leaves*, Quarterly Record, July-September 1980, No. 472 that “*In most cases the reading in the text of the Authorised Version is superior to the alternative given in the margin.*” Significantly, the TBS has not identified any inferior readings in the text.

**“Imperfections in the KJV”**

The leaflet concludes with 32 ‘imperfections’ in the Av1611. See Table 1. The ecumenical agreement between the NIV, NKJV, Rome (JB, Jerusalem Bible) and Watchtower (NWT, New World Translation) should be noted.

**Table 1**  
**‘X’ Marks the Spot - “Imperfections” in the AV1611, ‘Corrected’ by Modern Versions**

John 1:32-1 Peter 1:11: the Spirit as *“it”*, *“itself”* to *“he”*, *“himself”*  
 Acts 12:4: *“Easter”* to *“Passover”*  
 Genesis 44:7-Galatians 6:14: *“God forbid”* to e.g. *“Never may that happen”*, NWT, Romans 6:15  
 Titus 2:13, 2 Peter 1:1: *“the great God and our Saviour”* to *“our great God and Saviour”*  
 Acts 1:20: *“bishoprick”* to *“office”* or similar  
 Acts 19:37: *“churches”* to *“temples”*

Verse ↓	JB	NWT	NIV	NKJV
John 1:32				X
Romans 8:16	X		X	X
Romans 8:26	X		X	X
1 Peter 1:11			X	X
Acts 12:4	X	X	X	X
Genesis 44:7	X	X	X	X
Genesis 44:17	X	X	X	X
Joshua 22:29	X	X	X	X
Joshua 24:16	X	X	X	X
1 Samuel 12:23	X	X	X	X
1 Samuel 14:45	X	X	X	X
1 Samuel 20:2	X	X	X	X
Job 27:5	X	X	X	X
Luke 20:16		X	X	
Romans 3:4	X	X	X	X
Romans 3:6	X	X	X	X
Romans 3:31	X	X	X	X
Romans 6:2	X	X	X	X
Romans 6:15	X	X	X	X
Romans 7:7	X	X	X	X
Romans 7:13	X	X	X	X
Romans 9:14	X	X	X	X
Romans 11:1	X	X	X	X
Romans 11:11	X	X	X	X
1 Corinthians 6:15	X	X	X	X
Galatians 2:17	X	X	X	X
Galatians 3:21	X	X	X	X
Galatians 6:14	X	X	X	
Titus 2:13	X		X	X
2 Peter 1:1	X	X	X	X
Acts 1:20	X	X	X	X
Acts 19:37	X	X	X	X
<b>‘Improvements’</b>	<b>91 %</b>	<b>84 %</b>	<b>97 %</b>	<b>94 %</b>

### Conclusion

Having studied the supposed ‘imperfections’ of the AV1611 for over 25 years, this writer agrees with the J.A. Moorman’s comment in *When The KJV Departs From The “Majority” Text* p 28. J. A. Moorman is addressing ‘minority’ readings in the AV1611 but his comments apply to *all* AV1611 readings.

*“When a version has been the standard as long as the Authorized Version, and when that version has demonstrated its power in the conversion of sinners, building up of believers, sending forth of preachers and missionaries on a scale not achieved by all other versions and foreign language editions combined; the hand of God is at work. Such a version must not be tampered with. And in those comparatively few places where it seems to depart from the majority reading [or from however many supposedly ‘improved’ readings], it would be far more honouring toward God’s promises of preservation to believe that the Greek and not the English had strayed from the original!” Amen.*